

REMARKS

The application includes claims 1-2 and 4-24. The Office examined and rejected all of the claims in the case. With this paper, claims 1, 11 and 24 are changed, and the claims are otherwise unchanged.

With this paper claims 1, 11, and 24 are changed to recited that the plurality of messages sent by the sending terminal to a receiving terminal conveys a plurality of frames of a funny, so that each frame is therefore conveyed by one or more of the messages, and each frame is logically related to at least one other of the frames. Claims 1 and 11 already included all of the above limitation except for the recitation that the frames are for display in turn. Support for the "of a funny" language is throughout the application, and in particular at page 6, lines 14-16.

Applicant requests entry of the amendment on the grounds that the changes to the claims do not require a new search, since the only new limitation is, effectively, in respect to the "of a funny" display of the frames, added in order to incorporate into the claims a meaning of "frame" that is clear from the application. Also, the changes are believed to put the application in condition for allowance.

Rejections under 35 USC §102

At paragraph 2 of the Office action, claims 1, 11 and 24 are rejected under 35 USC §102 as being anticipated by U.S. Pat. No. 6,597,918 to Kim.

As is made clear in the application throughout, the term "frame" is used in the context of a so-called funny--not necessarily a comic strip, but including any message in comic strip format, and is to be understood in the sense that a

funny is made up of a sequence of frames to be viewed one at a time. The one-at-time viewing is illustrated in Fig. 1, which shows a mobile station displaying each frame in a series of frames. The invention as recited thus provides for sending a series of frames that make up what in the application is called a funny.

The use of the term "frame" in Kim is different. At col. 3, line 5, the term "frame" is defined implicitly:

For simplicity, the term "long message" as used herein will refer to a message exceeding the amount of data allowed in a short message frame of the SMS function.

Thus, a frame as used in Kim is a single SMS message payload. Therefore and further, Kim teaches breaking up a single long message--longer than allowed in a single SMS frame, sending it as a sequence of messages, and then reassembling it at the other end. So Kim does not disclose a plurality of messages being conveyed by a plurality of frames in the sense used in the application, i.e. frames of a funny, as in claims 1, 11 and 24; instead, Kim teaches breaking up one message that is longer than a single SMS frame and sending it in pieces. The invention and what is disclosed in Kim are therefore different, and in fact the invention could make use of what is disclosed in Kim in case of an invention frame (i.e. a funny frame) being longer than the longest allowed SMS frame.

Accordingly, applicant respectfully requests that the rejections under 35 USC §102 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 USC §103

At paragraphs 4-6 of the Office action, the other claims are rejected under 35 USC §103.

Since claims 1, 11 and 24 are believed allowable for the reasons given above, applicant respectfully requests that the rejections under 35 USC §103 be reconsidered and withdrawn.


Conclusion

For all the foregoing reasons it is believed that all of the claims now in the application are in condition for allowance and their passage to issue is earnestly solicited.

June 30, 2004
Date
WARE, FRESSOLA, VAN DER SLUYS
& ADOLPHSON LLP
755 Main Street, P.O. Box 224
Monroe, CT 06468-0224

tel: (203) 261-1234
Cust. No.: 004955

Respectfully submitted,


James A. Retter
Registration No. 41,266